

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3050 - Sierra Valley Library

Overall Rating

3

Ratings Summary

BOND ACT CRITERIA	RATING	
Population Growth		32%
Age and Condition	4	
Needs of residents/response of proposed project to needs	3	
Plan of service integrates appropriate technology	2	
Appropriateness of site	3	
Financial capacity (new libraries only)		yes

Non-Evaluative Comments

Residents of the Loyalton community currently receive library services from a 635 square foot leased facility. According to the Bond Act Regulations (Title 5, Division 2, Chapter 3, Article 1), a leased facility is considered to be an existing library only if the lease has a total duration of not less than 20 years.

Project Summary

Applicant:	Sierra, County of
Library Jurisdiction:	Plumas County Library
Project Type/Priority:	New Construction of Library/1
Project Square Footage:	3,579
State Grant Request:	\$666,755

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3050 - Sierra Valley Library

Age and Condition of Existing Library

Regulatory Basis: 20440, Appendices 1 & 3

RATING

4

Age Rating

4 = No Existing Facility
 4 = 1949 or older
 3 = 1950-1959
 2 = 1960-1964
 1 = 1965-1974
 0 = 1975-2003

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4

Structural Renovation Rating

4 = No Renovation
 4 = 1954 & earlier
 3 = 1955-1962
 2 = 1963-1972
 1 = 1973-1978
 0 = 1979-2003

N/A

R1	R2	R3

4 = Extremely Poor Condition
 3 = Poor condition
 2 = Acceptable condition
 1 = Good condition
 0 = Very good condition

Condition of Existing Library

1. Structural
2. Lighting
3. Energy
4. Health & Safety
5. ADA
6. Acoustical
7. Flexibility
8. Spatial Relationships
9. Site Considerations

N/A



R1	R2	R3

Rating panel comments

Library construction date: No existing library
 Library renovation date:

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3050 - Sierra Valley Library

Needs and Response to Needs

Regulatory Basis: 20440 pp. 26, 27, 60-69

RATING

3

Community Library Needs Assessment

1. Methodology & community involvement.
2. Community analysis/community agencies & organizations, service area demographics
3. Analysis of service needs/consistency with demographics
4. Service limitations for existing facility (if applicable)
5. Space needs assessment
6. Executive summary includes description of K-12 student population and their needs

N/A

R1	R2	R3
3	3	3
2	2	2
3	4	3
2	3	2
2	3	3

Library Plan of Service

7. How well project responds to needs of residents
8. How well project responds to needs of K-12 students as expressed in Needs Assessment
9. How well mission, roles, goals, objectives, service indicators are documented
10. How well types of services are documented
11. How well types of K-12 services are documented
12. How project fits into jurisdiction-wide Plan of Service

R1	R2	R3
3	3	3
3	4	3
2	3	3
3	3	3
3	4	3
2	3	3

Library Building Program

13. How well Building Program implements Plan of Service.
14. How well Building Program documents general requirements for Library Building.
15. How well spatial relationships are described.
16. How well individual spaces are sized and described.

R1	R2	R3
2	3	3
3	4	3
4	4	4
1	2	1

Conceptual Plans

17. How well net-assignable SF on plan matches Building Program
18. How well non-assignable SF on plan matches Building Program
19. How well spatial relationships on plan match Building Program

R1	R2	R3
4	3	3
4	3	3
3	3	3

Joint Use Cooperative Agreement

20. How well roles & responsibilities are defined.
21. How clearly joint library services are described.
22. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of hours of service.
23. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of staffing/volunteers.
24. How well ownership issues are resolved
25. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of sources & uses of funding
26. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of review & modification process
27. How well agreement demonstrates a workable, mutually beneficial long-term partnership.

R1	R2	R3
3	3	3
1	2	2
3	4	3
3	3	3
4	4	3
2	2	2
2	2	2
3	4	3

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3050 - Sierra Valley Library

Rating Panel Comments

R1:

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

This project has been designed as a multi-purpose joint use facility with the city of Loyalton being the applicant. It represents a three way partnering effort between Sierra County, Sierra County Children and Family First Commission, Sierra-Plumas Joint Unified School District. Sierra County is the only county in the state that does not have a county library and currently contracts with Plumas County for public library service (currently being done through various stations). The applicant utilized a variety of techniques to gather input from this small, geographically isolated and economically challenged community. Methods included: Survey (27 questions) distributed throughout the county; 29 focus groups; County Children's Summit; 2 community design charettes. Copies of the survey and tabulations were included but background materials and tabulations from other events were not. Community analysis was good but they chose to use 1990 census data for some of the information that was submitted (i.e. population by educational attainment, community population percentage, etc.). Did a very good job at listing proposed library services and have prioritized service needs based on community input. Space needs assessment is clear, however they used figures from the Portola Library as a standard rather than developing standards that would be more applicable to their local community. In addition a selection of conversion factors were included. YA Collection figures are provided but there doesn't seem to be an area designated for teens.

PLAN OF SERVICE

Have provided a list of 5 services at the beginning of the plan and these are being addressed by 6 broad service responses that are partially based on the Public Library Association's Planning Documents--Strategic Directions. Proposed services for children and youth have been addressed by the Homework Center which is targeting students in grades 4-12--seems to be a rather large age range considering the fact that teens do not like to be associated with children--and services for pre-school children. Objectives are not measurable and service indicators are not client-centered. Have cited mission statements for Plumas County Library (Sierra County will contract with them to provide library service in the proposed facility), the commission and school district--would have been helpful to have something specifically related to proposed multi-purpose facility and local community. Literacy services is one of the goals in the plan and although they do mention that they have literacy services provided by funding from the State Library, there is no discussion about the relationship between the existing service and what is being proposed for this facility. The description of how the proposed project fits into the jurisdiction-wide Plan of Service focuses primarily on a list of services that have been provided by Plumas County Library for the last 30 years (children's services, reference, etc.)

BUILDING PROGRAM

Bubble diagram shows an area (no square footage is included) that's identified as the Friends of the Library Shelving area, however unable to substantiate proposed service since it was not included in the needs assessment. One of the diagrams also showed 2 homework centers but only 1 is mentioned in the Plan of Service. There does not seem to be an area for teens even though they were consulted about their reading preferences. There is an indication that books will be combined with the adult collection which is not a preferable practice in public library service. The square footage of the Local History area seems large (398 sq. ft.) in light of the overall size of the proposed facility which is 3,341 sq. ft. (children's area is 310 sq.ft.).

A very good general requirements section both in terms of comprehensiveness and detail for this small rural library.

An excellent description of the library's spatial relationships both in narrative and graphic form.

Fairly well detailed space descriptions, however it is impossible to tell if they have been appropriately sized since there is no list of furniture and equipment provided for each space with the net-assignable space allocations in the space descriptions. Further, the square footage conversion factors for readers seats, staff workstations, shelving or any of the other pieces of furniture and equipment were not found in either the building program, needs assessment or plan of service. So essentially there is no way to tell how the square footages were developed and what the justification is for each. There is a summary of spaces in the program, but it appears that the square footage allocations have come from design work already done prior to the program.

CONCEPTUAL PLANS:

The floor plan delivers 4,014 net assignable square footage, or 93% of the 4,315 gross square footage dedicated for library use, exactly what the building program requires. Therefore, the floor plan has met building program square footage requirements perfectly for both assignable and non-assignable square footage.

Except for one isolated instance, that the Homework Center is not adjacent but is close to Local History Room (BP 40), the spatial

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3050 - Sierra Valley Library

Except for one isolated instance, that the Homework Center is not adjacent but is close to Local History Room (BP 40), the spatial relationships of library divisions and spaces illustrated on the floor plan follow building program requirements. However, there are several program spaces defined in the building program that are not individually delineated on the floor plan. These areas are: New Books (BP 28); Staff Workstation (BP 29); Audio-Visual shelving (BP 30); Friends of Library shelving (BP 30); Young Adult shelving (BP 32); Magazine shelving (BP 35); and Reference shelving (BP 35). Since these program spaces are not delineated on the floor plan, it is difficult to determine whether the spatial relationships of these spaces with respect to other library divisions and spaces match building program requirements. In spite of the instances mentioned herein, the floor plan has overall very well demonstrated the spatial relationship defined in the building program.

JOINT USE AGREEMENT:

This is a three way partnering effort between Sierra County, Sierra County Children and Family First Commission, and the Sierra-Plumas Joint Unified School District. The agreement is intended to constitute a joint powers agreement under the provision of the Government Code. Roles and responsibilities are clearly delineated. The description of the joint library services is limited and lacking specificities. The hours of service (library will be open 29 hours per week) are very good and there is a commitment from both the library and the school district to address staffing for the Homework Center. There will be a heavy reliance on volunteers. Ownership issues are perfectly addressed with %'s allocated for each partner and they have indicated that furniture and equipment that has been funded by Bond Act Funds, will remain as the property of the county and all other items will remain as the property of those who provided them. Although funding specifics are not provided, there is a commitment from the district to fund assistance for the Homework Center, the library to continue funding a portion of operations and the commission to provide a % of operational expenses. The review and modification process will be done on an annual basis by a joint advisory group, however there is no indication that input from users will be included.

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3050 - Sierra Valley Library

R2:

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

They used an adequate, English-language survey, with 211 responses (12% of the service population), 10 focus groups/community meetings and some individual interviews, as well as a couple of facility design charrettes and a dozen partner meetings/updates. Copies of the survey and the focus group questions were provided in the appendices, along with a detailed compilation of survey results. No compilation of results from any of the focus groups, community meetings, individual interviews, design charrettes, partner meetings/updates was provided, so there is no way for the reader to know what priorities emerged from those sessions, only from the survey. They probably did reach a good cross-section of the community. They provided a very good description of agencies, schools, and organizations related to the effort, but the demographics were less satisfactory, rarely including the required national comparisons and omitting any state or national comparisons for unemployment rate. They probably know their community well, but analysis of community characteristics included almost no implications of those characteristics for potential library services. Overall, the service needs analysis was excellent, including clear ties from the needs assessment results and/or demographics to the needs identified and including specific detailed and summary analysis of the survey data in support of their conclusions. The only drawback at all was the lack of detailed results of the other needs assessment instruments, meaning that the reader was presented with no evidence to support conclusions based solely on those other instruments; those were minimal, however. The detail in the space needs assessment is a little sketchy, making it difficult to determine the appropriateness of some conversion factors. It is not clear where the Career Center and Academic Achievement Center spaces are allocated (presumably either to the Homework Center or the Meeting Room.) However, the plan of service indicates that no separate space is allocated to the Career Center (it is basically "virtual") and the Academic Achievement Center is included in the Homework Center, but neither is clear in the space needs assessment section. Overall, the allocations and their presentation, however, are probably fine for this small facility at this point in the planning. The overall executive summary provides a very good general summary of the effort, with statements of K-12 and general population needs but little description of the K-12 population.

PLAN OF SERVICE

The mission statements of Plumas County Library and the other partners are provided; it would have been better had a specific Sierra Valley mission statement also been developed or that this presentation included more specific ties between the Plumas statement and the community library services in the Sierra Valley facility. The goals and objectives are library-centered rather than user-centered. The objectives are not generally measurable and only a very few service indicators are outcomes-based. Taken together, however, they do an excellent job of addressing the stated K-12 needs. The emphasis on student needs almost overwhelms those of the general public, but, in fact, those, too, are very well addressed in this project for this community. The jurisdiction-wide "fit" provides an excellent description of how Plumas County Library supports this branch and the definite need of the community for it, but it does not describe how the project fits into the jurisdiction-wide plan of service to help complete that library service picture.

BUILDING PROGRAM

The building program implements the plan of service very well, except for lack of clarity about the functionality, equipping, and placement of the "Literacy Services," "Literacy office/classroom," "Homework Center classroom," "Literacy Classroom," and "Literacy office/Homework Center classroom," "Literacy/Homework Center classroom," all of which I think are the same space. In addition, a separate entrance to the Literacy classroom is specified to "facilitate its use when the library is closed to the public," but no provision is made for access to restrooms when the library is closed. Another problem is the lack of a Master list of furniture and equipment, a Bond Act-required element; all that is provided is a list of furniture. The general requirements are well-done, clear, and specific for this small library facility. The spatial relationships seem reasonable and clear. The combination of spatial diagram plus Space Description narratives plus the tabular summary of relationships together are very helpful. The basis for space sizing are not apparent in the building program. There are no space allocations provided for equipment and furniture intended for individual spaces; some of this allocation information shows up in the needs assessment document but is absent here. Indeed, no listing of furniture/equipment is provided at the individual space description level at all. The overall chart on page 22 does not provide enough information to ensure that spaces are sized well, particularly when it seems that the column labeled "Occupancy per s.f." really should be labeled "S.F. per Occupant," and the meeting room allocations provided there do not match those in the Space Needs Assessment section (page 77) of the needs assessment document. The descriptions cover most of the detail items, but the narrative format tends to obscure rather than highlight those details. A space, without a square footage allowance, is defined for Friends of the Library Book Sale Shelving, but no friends book sale function was called for in the plan of service or needs analysis.

CONCEPTUAL PLANS:

Net-assignable space on the plans matches the building program exactly. It looks as if the building was designed first and a

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3050 - Sierra Valley Library

Net-assignable space on the plans matches the building program exactly. It looks as if the building was designed first and a summary of space chart created and then simply transferred into the building program. This is not the proper process. Further, note comments under building program which indicate that there is no way to determine how the net-assignable square footage allocations were developed. Without this justification, it appears the program was simply written to match the plan.

Non-assignable space on the plans appears to match what was called for in the building program very well. However the reviewer could not find a figure on the plans that represented the total non-assignable space for just the library portion of the project (the non-assignable square footage was only for wall space). The reviewer did add up all of the wall space and the square footage in what appeared to be the non-assignable spaces and came up with a 21% figure which compares very well to the 22% target non-assignable space in the needs assessment.

The conceptual plan meets the spatial relationships called for in the building program very well with a few exceptions:

The central entrance and lobby is not adjacent to the kitchenette, but it is close.

The New Books, Audio-Visual, Young Adult, Magazine, Reference and Friends shelving are not identified on the plan so there is no way to determine if they meet the required spatial relationships.

The Local History Room doesn't appear to be away from the Homework Center.

JOINT USE AGREEMENT

The roles and responsibilities are very clear from an administrative or operational perspective but not so much so, in the agreement, from an end-user perspective. The plan of service makes the joint use services quite clear but that clarity is not carried over well into this joint use agreement. Given this small, rural community, they have done an exceptional job in developing a set of hours that responds to the various needs of users in general and those of the joint use services in particular, and which are regular and as long as could reasonably be expected. Clearly a lot of thought went into the development of the schedule. The library's contribution in staffing and volunteers is probably as good as it could possibly be. Sierra County Office of Education (SCOE) apparently contributes 2 hours per day, 5 days per week to the Homework Center, but it is unclear what staffing is provided by other partners or for other joint use services. Ownership, as defined in Section 3.J, page 5, is clear and comprehensive and should provide a worthwhile guide should the partnership fall apart at some future time. There is clear commitment to staffing the library/homework center services on the part of the library and SCOE and a clear intent to provide "sufficient funds to ensure the management and maintenance of the FACILITY and MASTER LEASE AREA..." What is missing is a clear statement of such commitment to operation of the services, although Exhibit A's description of the FACILITY (page 18) does include a list of all of the service areas of the FACILITY. The review and modification process is specified only as annual and with no user input provided for. Exhibit G, page 28, provides that the Management Advisory Committee can propose changes at any time, so review could be more often than annual, but it is not formally set to be more often than that; more frequent, at least initially, would be a much more responsive approach. Although the partnership is not mutually-supported, it is pretty much mutually beneficial and has an excellent chance for longevity.

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3050 - Sierra Valley Library

R3

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The needs assessment process included a variety of methods to gather input from the residents of the service area, including a survey, community meetings, interviews, and focus groups, as well as design charrettes. Inclusion of copies of the survey and tabulations enhanced the clarity of the document, and the inclusion of similar information about the results of the other input mechanisms would have been a further enhancement. The demographics section of the community analysis was adequate, but lacked current census figures for some categories and omitted state/national demographic comparisons in many cases. The analysis of the community characteristics does not pull together the information to provide a clear picture of the community. The analysis of library service needs is well done and appeared to be consistent with the information gathered, but the lack of summary information about all of the input methods limits the review. The space needs assessment provides rationale for determining the collection size and the number of reader seats based on similar branches. However, the number of public workstations is unclear, and there is no square footage allocation indicated for public access computers. Conversion factors are missing except for a reference to use of Libris Design conversion factors for seating, making an assessment of the adequacy of the overall square footage uncertain.

PLAN OF SERVICE

The planned services are responsive to the needs assessment findings. The mission statement is that of the county library with which Sierra County contracts for library services rather than being one specific to the proposed library. The goals and objectives are not user-oriented, but the service indicators are excellent, with many being focused on user outcomes (e.g., improved grades for students using the homework center). However, read as a whole, the service plan is very responsive to the findings of the needs assessment. The fit of the proposed library into the jurisdiction is not addressed, but the benefit of the services of the library system is clearly described.

BUILDING PROGRAM

The building program is responsive to the earlier planning documents, and provides a very good general requirements section. Spatial relationships are well done and are shown in a detailed diagram, a narrative summary, and within each space sheet. Most relationships are consistent throughout the document. Individual space sheets are very brief, providing less than optimal direction to the design team. Telecommunication and electrical needs are not mentioned or are mentioned very briefly. Space sheets do not contain a listing of the furnishings and equipments to be located in the space, which will result in imprecise or unexpected square footage allocations from the design team. No master furniture and equipment listing is provided.

CONCEPTUAL PLANS

The net assignable SF is an exact match of the building program data. It appears to just be one set of numbers which makes you wonder if the building program was the driving document or a trailer document.

I could find no mention of the non-assignable SF in the building program. There was some data in the Needs Assessment that helped with the non-assignable SF issue. On the plan only wall space was indicated as non-assignable. The reviewer has to take spaces off the table on the plan to see if items such as bathrooms could be summed to get near the assumed non-assignable SF percentage. This puzzle was hard to follow and would lead one to believe the conceptual plan was driving the creation of the building program.

The spatial relations were basically accurate when they could be established, but there were several areas that were not labeled.

P. 1.6 New books and OPAC not labeled.

P. 2.1 Staff workroom not labeled.

P. 2.4 OPAC not labeled.

P. 4.1 Not labeled, OPAC new books, AV, YA seating, magazine shelf, reference shelf.

JOINT USE AGREEMENT

This is a complex agreement that combines the lease agreement and the joint use agreement, making assessment of the joint venture aspects difficult. Roles and responsibilities are well described, but the description of the joint venture services is somewhat generalized. The hours of service are very good, as is the staffing level, which will be augmented by volunteers. Ownership issues are very clearly described. While specific funding amounts are not given, there is a clear commitment to provide the joint venture services as described. The review and modification process provides for an annual meeting, but changes to be recommended by an advisory committee at any time. A more proactive approach with more frequent meetings to monitoring the services during their early stages would provide greater assurance that the services are performing as intended.

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3050 - Sierra Valley Library

Integration of Electronic Technologies

RATING

2

Regulatory Basis: p.68, 20440, Appendix 4

Integration of Electronic Technologies

1. Appropriateness of electronic technologies in Plan of Service, based on Needs Assessment
2. How well the integration of electronic technologies is documented in Plan of Service
3. How well the integration of electronic technologies is documented in the Building Program

R1	R2	R3
3	3	3
2	3	2
2	2	2

Rating Panel Comments

R1:

Applicant has responded to identified community need about providing additional computers, however there seem to be different figures for the exact number of computers that will be provided in the needs assessment and in the plan of service. The new facility will connect via Wireless Link to the current Internet access portal at the Loyalton Elementary School. It doesn't sound as if wireless connectivity will be immediately available (page 35). The general public will have electronic access to the North State Cooperative Library System Catalog as well as to databases from Plumas County. Applicant has indicated the possibility of distance learning at the facility by making classes from the Feather River Community College available by satellite.

R2:

The electronic technologies planning is a little brief, but it does address the established needs. There is some level of confusion regarding the number of computers and by whom provided within the plan of service and between it and the needs assessment documentation (19 plus 1 literacy staff computer and with 3 in the local history room, page 75 of the needs assessment; 12 computers in the Homework Center provided by the SCOE/SPJUSD, page 23 of the plan of service; 17 computers from grant funds, with 2 in the local history from, page 36 of the plan of service) - not a big problem, just inserts an element of confusion into the review process. The general requirements discussion is fairly limited and its total of computers is inconsistent both internally to itself (19 stated; 20 detailed) and between it and other parts of the building program and plan of service (total of 19 or 17; 2 or 3 in the Local History Room; 1, 2, or 3 total for staff?). The lack of telecommunications/computer detail in the spaces and the absence of a separate list of technology items (a bond act requirement) continue to make the equipment specifications unclear, and that makes it harder to be certain the spaces really will support the plan of service's technology needs. For this small facility, however, the risks are probably relatively small.

R3:

It's clear that the planners know that technology will play an important role in providing library services and the technology planned for the library appear to be consistent with the needs assessment findings. However, the service plan lacks specificity in discussing the types of technology solutions (e.g., they are discussed as "a collection of print and online resources" under reference, "appropriate print and electronic resource materials" in the discussion of the homework center, and "computers with educational software and high-speed internet access" in the literacy section, making it difficult to determine how well the needs of the residents will be met. There are a few specific titles mentioned (e.g., NoveList and Electric Library).

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3050 - Sierra Valley Library

Site

Regulatory Basis: p.39, 20440, Appendix 1

RATING

3

Appropriateness of Site

1. Equal access for all residents in service area.
2. Accessibility via public transit.
3. Accessibility via pedestrian and bicycle.
4. Accessibility via automobile.
5. Adequacy of automobile parking.
6. Adequacy of bicycle parking.
7. Overall parking rationale.
8. Shared parking agreement (if applicable).
9. Visibility of site & proposed library building in service area
10. How well site fits community context & planning
11. Site selection process and summary.

R1	R2	R3
3	3	3

N/A

2	3	3
3	3	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4

N/A

3	3	3
3	3	4
4	4	4

Site Description

12. Adequacy of size of site.
13. Appropriateness of site configuration
14. Appropriateness of site/surrounding area.
15. Appropriateness of site based on placement of building, parking, access roads, pathways, expansion and parking.

R1	R2	R3
3	3	3
3	3	3
3	3	3
3	3	3

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3050 - Sierra Valley Library

Rating Panel Comments

Drainage issues: OK

Geotechnical issues: The geotechnical report did not identify any significant conditions that would significantly impact the ability to build on the site or substantially raise the cost of completing the building.

R1:

The site of the proposed library is in Loyalton on the ground of the Loyalton Elementary School, immediately adjacent to the high school, the community park that has a municipal swimming pool and social hall where municipal meetings are held and is four blocks from State Hwy. 49. It is located within 1/2 mile from the commercial core of Loyalton which is located in the northern section of the Sierra Nevada's. The proposed site has direct street access to Beckwith Street, a major access road from the heart of Sierra Valley into the city of Loyalton, where approximately one-half of the service population lives, and is situated within a 1/2 mile walking distance from the middle school. There is no transit system or transit authority in Sierra County. New sidewalks will be built that will connect the existing sidewalk at the elementary school. The site is equidistant to all outlying areas that will be served by the facility. There are 17 on site automobile parking spaces (12 are required) with a total of 37 spaces available. There are 6 sheltered bicycle parking spaces that are located close to the entrance. The multipurpose facility will include a daycare, library and offices for the Sierra County Children and Family First Commission, all sharing a common site. Alternative sites were considered but they did not meet the criteria that was used in the site selection process and the community felt that the school location was the best choice.

R2:

Loyalton is in far northwestern part of the service area and is not centrally located for all of the residents of the entire county service area, however 1/2 of the population of the county resides in the Sierra Valley where Loyalton is located. The site is not centrally located in Loyalton, but on the edge of town. The site is considered by the applicant to be an educational center for the community being adjacent to the elementary school, high school, community park, swimming pool, and social hall where the City Council and County Supervisors hold their meetings.

Sidewalks that currently terminate at the elementary school will be extended to the library as part of the project's site development plan. Most all of residents of Loyalton are within 15 minutes walking time to the proposed library site. There is no indication of bike lanes on nearby streets in the application, but there are 6 bike parking spaces to be placed on the front porch in a covered area near the front doors to the library. This not shown on the site plan, however.

The proposed library site will be located on Beckwith Street (Sierra County Road A-24 with no traffic counts provided), and 4 blocks from State Route 49 which has 1,890 vehicles per day.

There are 17 parking spaces available on-site and in front of the proposed library building, and another 20 parking spaces within 500' of the front door, but closer to the elementary school.

The proposed library will be highly visible on Beckwith Street, but not from SR 49. The proposed library site is 1/2 mile from the main commercial area of Loyalton.

A group of project planners considered alternate sites and public input was taken. While selection criteria were described to some extent, it is not clear that the same criteria were applied to all possible sites.

There does not appear to be an plan to expand either the building or parking shown on the site plan.

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3050 - Sierra Valley Library

R3:

The Sierra County/Loyalton library site is in the nexus of local activities (school, swimming pool, etc.) Although a site on Hwy 49 would be more convenient to those from out of town but within the sprawling rural service area, it is only four blocks from Hwy 49, and quite convenient.

Sidewalks are being extended to the site. Bike riding should be safe on these rural side streets, and a 6- or 7 -slot covered bike rack is to be provided in front. Auto access is good: Hwy 49 is only a few blocks away via County A-24, which is right in front. Both onsite and offsite parking is generous, greatly exceeding code.

Although the building is not on Hwy 49, the 30' roof peak will make it visible. Its location on A-24, and adjacency to the school (a local gathering place), makes it quite "knowable." The site clearly responds to community concerns, as presented by leaders of civic organizations and service providers. Alternative sites did not respond to site requirements.

The site can be evaluated not as a stand-alone site (in which case it is barely adequate, being the same size as the footprint), but as part of the school - and - library complex, sharing a combined site. In that perspective, the land used is sufficient to the task. Again, as a combined library project, the "library" part of the configuration works. The overall organization and access of the project is sensible.

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3050 - Sierra Valley Library

Financial Capacity

Regulatory Basis: Bond Act p. 5, Section 19998 (a) (7)

Rating Panel Comments:

Applicant has committed to the on-going operation of the completed library.